Remarks

This paper is responsive to a non-final Office action mailed April 5, 2005.

Paragraph 1 of the DETAILED ACTION objected to the drawings because Figure 1 failed to show a "buffer 160" as described in the specification and because Figure 4 did not include an identifier "400" appearing in the specification.

The objection to Figure 1 is dealt with by amending that Figure to show a buffer element 160 at an output of node A in the illustrated network. Support for the illustration of the buffer element can be found in paragraph 15 of the specification.

The objection to Figure 4 is dealt with by removing the reference numeral "400" from paragraph 22 of the specification, which eliminates the basis for the objection to the drawing. The reference numeral is superflous and its removal has no impact on the adequacy of the specification description.

Paragraph 2 of the DETAILED ACTION objected to Figure 5 because the reference numeral "522" was inadvertently used to refer to two different elements. The Figure is being amended to change the first of the two uses to "520", the correct reference numberal for the first of the two referenced elements. Support for this change is found in paragraph 39 of the specification.

Paragraph 3 of the DETAILED ACTION objected to claim 9 for erroneous use of the phrase "greater then" when "greater than" was intended. Claim 9 is being amended to correct the error, which eliminates the basis for the objection. Claim 10 was objected to only as being dependent upon the objected claim 9. The amendment to claim 9 eliminates the stated basis for

09/843,315 (FR9-2000-0019)   - 8 -

the objection to claim 10. In accordance with paragraph 7 of the DETAILED ACTION, these two claims should now be allowable.

Paragraph 8 of the DETAILED ACTION objects to claims 5 - 7 as filed as being dependent upon a rejection base claim but indicates the claims would be allowable if rewritten to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Original claim 5 ultimately depends on original claim 1 through a chain of intervening claims including claim 4 and either of claims 2 and 3. Original claim 1 is amended to include the limitations originally set forth in claims 5, 4 and 2. Claim 1, as amended, is effectively original claim 5 recast in independent form. As such, it should be considered allowable for the same reasons as claim 5 is considered allowable.

Claims 6 and 7 were rejected only as being dependent upon a rejected claim. These claims, originally dependent upon claim 5, have been amended to depend from amended claim 1 and should be allowable for the same reasons as claim 1.

Claims 9 and 10 depend on allowed claim 8 and were objected to only because of the claim 9 typographical error noted in paragraph 3 of the DETAILED ACTION. The typographical error is corrected in this paper. A misspelling in claim 10 was also noted during preparation of this paper and has been corrected. Both claims 9 and 10 should be considered allowable for the same reasons as allowed claim 8.

In summary, amended claim 1 includes all of the limitations of original claim 5 and should be considered allowable because claim 5 is allowable, claims 2-5 have been canceled, claims 6 and 7 now depend from claim 1 and should be allowable for the same reasons as that claim, claim 8 was allowed, claims 9 and 10 have been amended to correct typographical errors

PATENT
IBM Docket No. FR9-2000-0019

and should be considered for the same reasons their parent claim (claim 8) is considered allowable.

In view of the corrections to the drawings and the specification and the amendments to the claims, it is submitted that this application is now in condition for allowance.

Respectfully Submitted,

Gerald R. Woods, Reg. No. 24,144
Attorney of Record

IBM Corporation
T81/503
PO Box 12195
Research Triangle Park, NC 27709
919-543 - 7204
FAX 919-254-4330

09/843.315 (FR9-2000-0019)   - 10 -